

Remarks/Arguments

This paper is submitted responsive to the Office Action mailed February 20, 2007. Reconsideration of the application in light of the accompanying remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

In the aforesaid action, the Examiner objected to certain informalities in the claims, rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and rejected all claims over prior art.

By the present amendment, claims 1-11 have been cancelled and rewritten as new claims 12-21. Subject matter from former dependent claim 7 has been introduced into new independent claim 12. The claim language has also been carefully reviewed to address the Examiner's concerns as to grammar and definiteness.

Claim 12 calls for a trigger element connected to the battery, wherein the trigger element is turned on by the manual opening of a cover (28) mounted adjacent to the inlet (33) of the device. A self-holding circuit (5) is connected between battery (1) and drive controller (2) to switch self-holding circuit (5) from the inactive to the active condition when trigger element (6) is turned on to supply electric power from battery (1) through self-holding circuit (5) to drive controller (2), validation sensor (4) and conveyor (3). Further, a shutoff circuit (7) is called for which has a control terminal for receiving a control signal from drive controller (2) to switch self-holding circuit (5) in the active condition to the inactive condition and thereby interrupt the power supply except dark current after the stacking device (41) stows the

valuable paper, which has been decided to be genuine, in the accumulation chamber (44). It is submitted that nothing in the art of record discloses or suggests this subject matter.

Claim 1 had been rejected as obvious based upon a combination of WO 92/09057-A1 to Barnes et al. in view of US 4,784,274 to Mori et al. In rejecting claim 7 which contained subject matter now added to claim 1, the Examiner indicated that Barnes in view of Mori failed to disclose a push-button operated trigger element, and did not deal specifically with a cover which activates the trigger element as claimed in claim 12. Rather, the Examiner relied upon US 4,662,621 to Lundblad as teaching this subject matter. In Lundblad, the discriminating device comprises a trigger element that is operated by pushing a button 24b. Nothing in the art of record, however, discloses or suggests a cover for or near the inlet, wherein opening of the cover is tied to operation of the conveyer.

Claim 12 is submitted to be allowable over the art of record.

Dependent claims 13-21 all depend directly or indirectly from claim 12, and are submitted to be in condition for allowance based upon this dependency, and further in their own right.

An earnest and thorough effort has been made to respond to all issues raised in the Office Action and to place the claims of the application in condition for allowance.

10/525,335

Amendment dated May 21, 2007

Response to Office Action mailed Feb. 20, 2007

Page 8 of 8

If, upon considering this paper, the Examiner determines that issues remain which could be resolved by telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss same.

It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this paper. If, however, any such fee or fee deficiency is due, please charge same to Deposit Account 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,
Noriyuki Kanno et al.

By /george a. coury/
George A. Coury
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,309
Tel: (203) 777-6628
Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: May 21, 2007